



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT IMPORTANT DECISIONS

ADOPTION—INHERITANCE FROM NATURAL KINDRED.—The plaintiff, a minor, by his guardian sued to recover his share of his deceased grandfather's estate under the law of succession of the state of California. After the death of his father and mother he had been adopted into another family. The statute of California provides that the natural parents of an adopted child are "relieved * * * of all parental duties towards and all responsibilities for the child so adopted and have no right over it," and the child and persons adopting "shall sustain towards each other the legal relation of parent and child and have all the rights and be subject to all the duties of that relation." *Held*, that this statute would be construed strictly and the child adopted would still inherit from the natural kindred other than his father and mother. *In Re Darling's Estate* (Calif. 1916), 159 Pac. 606.

Adoption, though not recognized under the common law, is allowed by statute in this country. Being in derogation of the common law adoption statutes are usually construed strictly against the adopted child, *Hockaday v. Lynn*, 200 Mo. 456; *Keeghan v. Geraghty*, 101 Ill. 26. It has been held generally that the child may inherit from its adoptive parents, *Flannigan v. Howard*, 200 Ill. 396; *Patterson v. Browning*, 146 Ind. 160. But unless the statute expressly so provides, the adoptive child cannot inherit from the kindred of its adoptive parents. *Van Derlyn v. Mack*, 137 Mich. 146; *Hockaday v. Lynn*, *supra*; *Estate of Jobson*, 164 Cal. 312. Unless the statute expressly provides to the contrary the adopted child will inherit from the natural as well as from the adoptive parents. *Wagner v. Varner*, 50 Ia. 532; *Clarkson v. Hatton*, 143 Mo. 47. But the statute in California expressly provides that all parental relations are at an end between the natural parents and the child, and so he could not inherit from them. Does it prevent his inheriting from his own kindred other than his natural parents? The principal case holds that it does not, on the ground that these statutes must be construed no more liberally than the words require. Under a similar statute in Massachusetts, however, it was held the child could not inherit from the grandfather both as a child and as a grandchild where he had been adopted by the grandfather after his father's death. *Delano v. Bruerton*, 148 Mass. 619. Contra, *Wagner v. Varner*, *supra*. But the principal case is distinguishable on its facts from the Massachusetts case and seems to accord with the trend of authority.

ANIMALS—STRAYING UPON THE HIGHWAY.—Plaintiff's automobile was upset and damaged by defendant's sheep which had escaped to the highway through a defective hedge. The sheep were on the road in violation of § 25 of the *Highway Act*, 1864, under which defendant was subsequently prosecuted and fined. *Held*, Defendant was under no duty to plaintiff as a member of the public to keep sheep, not shown to be vicious or mischievous, from straying on the highway, and was therefore not liable for the injury caused by them. *Heath's Garage Limited v. Hodges* [1916], 2 K. B. 370.